
The Ideal Male in Late Antiquity: Claudian's Example of Flavius Stilicho

Geoffrey Nathan

The study of gender in the pre-modern period has generally focused on women, and for very good reasons. However, recent work in the last twenty years has expanded conceptual horizons. Third-wave feminist scholarship in particular has broadened the ways in which historians chart the feminine in the classical and postclassical worlds. While gender is still a key vector of cultural and social demarcation, we must now also consider class, ethnicity, sexuality, geographical location and other socially constructed markers in order to offer a more complex interpretation of how identity was both defined and understood. This conceptual framework has equal application to studies of masculinity, as a considerable amount of research in this journal and elsewhere has demonstrated.

In that context, this paper seeks to examine two aspects of maleness and masculinity in the late Roman world: how certain male virtues increasingly and exclusively associated with the emperor were appropriated by a high-ranking military officer and how that appropriation also exemplified a partial redefinition of masculinity, to meet both the interests of a new age and the specific needs of that officer. Flavius Stilicho, the man in question, engineered this appropriation largely through the poetry of Claudian, who wrote extensively of the general's character and career. It is Claudian's depiction of Stilicho as the ideal male that shall be my focus here.

By way of introduction, current understanding of what constituted masculinity in the long history of Rome recognises that the concept went through important changes and developed in markedly different ways over time.¹ Our earliest surviving expressions of its conceptualisation date from the late republic. Most agree that by Cicero's day in the first century BCE, masculinity was associated not only with courage in war, but also with those things that gave Romans their strength and indeed their right to rule.² *Virtus* is the word commonly used, a term that etymologically derives from the word for man (*vir*). Modern scholars have generally interpreted the concept of *virtus* – probably the most generic term for manliness and closest Latin analogue for the Greek word, *arete* (ἀρετή) – in various ways. Most are of the general opinion that the term implied a broad ethical quality – a distillation and source of a whole range of male-specific virtues.³ Recent scholarship, however, has re-emphasised its connection to aristocratic prowess in battle. For example, Nathan Rosenstein, in his authoritative discussion of war during the middle republic, has argued that *virtus* sat firmly within the aristocratic search for

glory in war to meet political and social ends consistent with Rome's oligarchs.⁴ (Indeed, the dedication of a temple to *Virtus* by Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus in 234 BCE after his war against the Ligurians is not only typical of aristocratic behaviour, but its subsequent history moreover suggests it was the preserve of the elite.)⁵ And in one of the most penetrating, but also somewhat problematic discussions, Myles McDonnell has demonstrated the importance of Hellenistic influences on the metamorphosis of the term from something to do with war to a broader ethical concept in the late republic, while at the same time arguing untenably that *virtus* at its core meant the courage shown in the face of an enemy's fierce aggression.⁶ This broadening of the concept was closely tied to a traditional aristocracy that in the first century BCE increasingly did not participate personally in warfare or even politics.

Notions of manliness or masculinity in the Empire have also been extensively scrutinised, although these studies have frequently been discussed within more detailed explorations of Christian ideas of gender and the inversion of sexuality.⁷ More basically, in a period spanning four centuries and in an empire encompassing a broad geographic, sociopolitical and linguistic expanse, variant models of masculinity were not only likely, but inevitable.⁸ In general, however, there seems to be a general consensus by ancients and moderns alike that *virtus* in the aristocratic republican sense largely became the preserve of emperors and their accomplishments: Tacitus, for example, deplored its passing in his penetrating annalistic narratives, and tried to preserve it in the *Agricola*, a de facto eulogy (*laudatio funebris*) to his late father-in-law. The fact, too, that most Romans in the imperial period, elite or common, had no personal experience of war must also have been an important factor in its reformulation. This inevitably led to a reorientation among the aristocracy of what it meant to be male. In the rhetoric of masculinity, especially the way in which it related to broader questions of morality, Roman manhood in the Empire became strongly associated with one's denial of excessive pleasure, sexual and otherwise, and by extension notions of self-control.⁹ That is, the control of one's self – to paraphrase Foucault – became synonymous with control of those under a man's ostensible authority. The legal paternal power (*patria potestas*) of a *paterfamilias* became increasingly associated with *potestas* in a more literal sense: the imposition of a man's will over his environment, not excluding his own body, and by extension the rearticulation of patriarchy in both a personal and general social context. This also, almost by definition, redirected masculinity into the private sphere.¹⁰ It is this concern with private life, the household and the self that in part focuses attention on new ideas concerning male virtues.

Claudian and Stilicho

In the context of these changes, my interest here is to examine how Claudian, a young Alexandrine poet with 'the mind of Vergil and the inspiration of Homer', contributed to the construction of Roman masculinity in his depictions of his patron, Flavius Stilicho, the regent of the emperor Honorius and de facto ruler of the Western Empire from 395 until his untimely execution in 408.¹¹ With one notable exception, the general figures prominently in all of the poet's major works, as well as in a number of minor ones.¹² Indeed, he is so heavily praised that it has led some to suggest that his presence and powers border on the supernatural.¹³ This is overstating the case somewhat. Claudian

is usually able to keep the line between human and divine distinct, and it is important to note that allusions and comparisons to gods and heroes of the past were part of a long-standing practice of formal praise.¹⁴ It is also perhaps worth mentioning that, for the most part, divinities in the Graeco-Roman world were mythologically and by tradition anthropomorphic, and thus such comparisons were common and indeed expected. Of greater interest than whether Claudian chose to make such comparisons is the issue of *how* the poet deployed those comparisons and, to an equal degree, to what purpose or end. It is important, however, to start with this key point: Claudian's Stilicho stays firmly within the realm of the human. That said, as will become apparent, while lavish praise of the general had a number of goals – ideal protector, ideal soldier, ideal statesman – it also depicts him as the ideal of Roman manhood.

Before discussing Claudian's Stilicho, however, there are several points worth noting about the nature of the poetry itself. Clearly a product of a traditional educational regime – like many literary artists of late antiquity – Claudian shows only the slightest indication that contemporary linguistic practices touched upon his *oeuvre* at all, preferring instead to glory in both real and re-imagined literary traditions. Although a poet, he is explicitly writing panegyric and as such it is epideictic, designed to illustrate rhetorical and oratorical skill, and to do so publicly.¹⁵ As such, Claudian's work followed the conventions of the genre in terms of language, metre, structure, *exempla*, literary allusions and the like.¹⁶ Thus, classical and often archaic vocabulary and syntax, mythological and historical references, hexametric verse and other traditional poetic features characterise his body of work.¹⁷ Indeed, as Catherine Ware has recently argued, the court poet was heavily indebted to and influenced by an epic poetic tradition shaped by the work of Vergil.¹⁸ It is thus unsurprising that Alan Cameron, almost by process of elimination, can classify Claudian uncomfortably as a first rate Silver Age author – an idea recently echoed by others.¹⁹

This leads to a second point. Given the nature and purpose of panegyric expression, Claudian's image of Stilicho – full of factual errors, distortions and omissions – must be viewed almost solely as a rhetorically pregnant representation of the man and his accomplishments, one that has only the thinnest basis in reality. While his poems do express novel ideas, the mode of expression is a very good example of a very old style. To simply say Claudian's depictions of Stilicho are idealised would therefore be mouthing a truism; rather, we should speak of his representation in terms of degrees of cultural verisimilitude. Moreover, as Maud Gleason has persuasively argued, the semiotics of public performance was geared to meet and to emphasise conventional gender expectations.²⁰ In this particular case, the poet's intended audience and certainly his patron would have expected as much; he wrote for an audience made up of 'the social and political hegemony of men'.²¹ And finally, as a number of scholars have also noted, since the general needed to establish his *bona fides*, Stilicho had to legitimise his status to western senatorial aristocrats, many of whom no doubt saw the 'half-Roman' as an interloper and a barbarian.²²

Two other important issues concerning Claudian's poetry are worth bearing in mind. First, in keeping with this 'jeweled style' (as Michael Roberts terms it), there are in his major poems no explicit references to Christianity, its tenets or its controversies.²³ Whether he was Christian or not – or what kind – is not really an issue here; rather, we should be aware that contemporary religious tenets would have been largely inconsistent with the literary conventions of the panegyric and therefore would not have

figured prominently (if at all) in the poet's depiction of Stilicho.²⁴ That said, as I shall argue, there were some novel parallels with Christian ideas concerning the body.

The last important component of the assembled work is one of chronology. Claudian's earliest datable poem was composed in 395 CE, when he wrote his first panegyric celebrating the consulships of the aristocratic brothers Olybrius and Probinus. He thus began his career when Honorius had recently come to the throne under Stilicho's regency and, by extension, witnessed Stilicho's new ascendancy over the western imperial court. The last clear reference in Claudian's poetry to current events dates to 404, after which some scholars presume he died.²⁵ Thus, while the poet could, and did, draw upon Stilicho's past, some of the most important events in his life – his second consulship, the burning of the Sybilline Books, his defeat of Radagasis in 405 (and perhaps his political *denouement*) – are obviously not treated at all.²⁶

We must finally say something about the historical general and the age in which he lived. Son of a Vandal military officer and a Roman noblewoman, Flavius Stilicho proved himself to be a talented soldier and canny politician who rose to prominence under Theodosius I 'the Great' (r. 379–95). We know practically nothing of his parents.²⁷ However, his skills, his loyalty to the last emperor of a unified Roman Empire and possibly his religious orthodoxy merited him his master's niece, Serena, in marriage.²⁸ Serving as one of Theodosius's most important generals (*magister militum*, probably of Thrace), he commanded the eastern army in its invasion of the western empire to remove the pretender Eugenius from power in 394. Not long after that brief but hard-fought civil war, Theodosius died, willing his two sons, the elder, Arcadius and the younger, Honorius (then aged ten or eleven) to the eastern and western thrones respectively. While Arcadius had remained in Constantinople, Honorius had accompanied his father on his final campaign and it was left to Stilicho – ostensibly at Theodosius's deathbed request – to see to his young son's accession to the western throne in Italy and moreover to act as his guardian until the boy reached his majority.

Stilicho had little trouble establishing his new role in the west, but he also claimed this guardian status over Arcadius as well.²⁹ This created considerable dissension between the eastern and western courts for well over a decade and indirectly exacerbated relations with the Visigoths – a conflict that eventually and indirectly led to the city of Rome's sack in August 410 CE. Eastern claims notwithstanding, Stilicho was in no hurry to relinquish authority as Honorius approached adulthood. The young emperor's guardian controlled all aspects of governance, gaining a new title, possibly created especially for him, *magister utriusque militum* (literally, general of both armies, but meaning commander-in-chief).³⁰ He ensured Honorius married his eldest child, Maria, in 398 and when she died ten years later, he quickly had his son-in-law remarried to his second daughter, Thermantia. It was not until a number of political twists of fate in 408 that Flavius Stilicho lost political support, was arrested and executed in late August. While an effective general and administrator, his complete dominance of the state earned him many enemies (including Honorius) and meant that his political downfall proved fatal.³¹

Claudian, however, provided a rather different spin on Stilicho's impressive, if chequered career. The surfeit of praise he lavishes upon the general, worthy of much greater space than permitted here, necessarily means that we must also limit our examination or risk offering an almost wholly descriptive piece. For purposes of

representation, then, I propose to focus principally, though not exclusively, on three nominally different genres of poetry – panegyric, epic and epithalamium (the latter two admittedly panegyric as well) – and examine the character of Stilicho in each.³² For the first, we shall focus on the panegyric celebrating Stilicho's consulship in 400 CE; for the second, Claudian's account of the brief campaign fought against Alaric in 401, sententiously titled *de Bello Gothico*; and for the third, the epithalamium celebrating the wedding of Honorius and Maria.

On the Consulship of Stilicho (De Consulatu Stilichonis)

The panegyric celebrating Stilicho's consulship in 400 is Claudian's most extensive surviving work and it comes in three separate parts: the first book recounts the general's military life and deeds up until his consulship in 400; the second book praises the fruits of peace brought by his regency and his reluctance to accept the curule chair; and the third explains how lucky Rome is to have Stilicho as a consul – complete with extended soliloquys from various deities.

These three sections, perhaps not coincidentally, focus on three different aspects of Stilicho's masculinity. The first book begins with an explanation of how perfect the general was in body and mind, and how his gifts contrast with those of other men. His face is fair, his soul beautiful; fortunate in public life and in private, renowned in war and moral in public administration:

For indeed, from the time when mortals began tending the land, never have so many blessings been conceded to one man. This one is adorned with a handsome face, but his morals are disgraceful; another is blessed with a beautiful soul, but his body suffers. That man is eminent in war, but pollutes peace with his vices. This man has a fortunate public life, but his private life is lacking. Each is imparted something; and each ennobled by a single gift: this man having beauty, him prowess in arms, him strength, that one expertise in law, and this one in virtuous children and wife. Amongst all men these are scattered; in you they flow mixed together; and these divided gifts, any one of which create happy men, you possess altogether.³³

The poet continues. The general's father, whose ethnicity Claudian passes over with unsurprising brevity, was a war hero; barely a man himself, Stilicho is invested with important military and political duties. Throughout the first book, Stilicho's commitment to duty and his success in war are the overriding themes. He thrives during warfare, his body is strengthened and beautified by adversity. His physical virtues and success in manly valour are thus closely linked:

And the burning intensity of your visage and the beauty of your limbs, which the songs [of poets] not even graced the demigods, gave assurance of your [future] leadership. And wherever you in your exaltedness walked in the City, you saw citizens making room and rising for you, although you were but a soldier. The silent support of the people already singled you out, everything which the court must soon acknowledge.³⁴

Stilicho's character and drive are rewarded early on by Theodosius giving his niece and adopted daughter to the faithful general in marriage.

The second book of the panegyric emphasises Stilicho's civic roles. At the outset, Claudian claims that the general was motivated by love and faith: love for Theodosius and keeping faith by protecting Stilicho's family. From that, all his virtues spring (ll. 100–31): justice (*iustitia*), patience (*patientia*), constancy (*constantia*),

temperance (*temperies*) and wisdom (*prudencia*). He thus encapsulated the cardinal virtues articulated by Plato (perhaps an indication of the poet's Greek education), adopted first by some Romans and later by Christian theologians who were Claudian's contemporaries.³⁵ These are, as one might surmise, also qualities that frequently characterised emperors. Admittedly, this collection itself is problematic, as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill argued thirty years ago, since the accumulation of virtues eventually became a homogenous conglomeration of an unreal 'ideal' emperor.³⁶ But even so, these specific virtues were not only imperial ones, but ones that were worthy of being included in panegyrics directed to emperors. The third- or fourth-century rhetor Menander of Laodicea, in his *Second Treatise* devoted to the panegyric, has a section focused on emperors (*βασιλικὸς λόγος*) and states that rulers should be brave, just, temperant, and wise.³⁷

One other masculine virtue, or more accurately metaphor, is particularly notable. Stilicho is also described as a *clipeus* – ceremonially a shield of bravery awarded to a soldier who had saved the life of a comrade in battle, but also significantly a term monopolised by Augustus and his imperial successors to commemorate their bravery and protection of the state.³⁸ Marble copies of Augustus's *clipeus virtutis* survive, praising his justice (*iustitia*) and mercy to enemies in war (*clementia*) – familiar male virtues found in a ruler.³⁹ Claudian uses *clipeus* twice to describe Stilicho in the panegyric, as well as in several other poems.⁴⁰ And this was clearly something unique: no other human in Claudian's work is given such an epithet, one that identified a man of power with a symbol of power. This military and civic shield, as John Lobur has noted, was one of several key symbols that legitimised and insinuated the *princeps*' control of the state.⁴¹ In Stilicho's case, protection over the imperial family and the state itself are synonymous; the general is both father-in-law of the emperor and father of the state (l. 166: '*Augusti socerum regnique parentem*').

The final book celebrating Stilicho's consulship is a curious and not always elegant mixture of the previous two. He enjoys his duties for their own sake:

Great honours do not benefit him, so much as the work itself. He loathes the empty cheers and triumphs, with a better ceremony in the hearts of men.⁴²

There is a strong commitment by Stilicho not only to serve Honorius – he was emperor, after all (at least in name) – but also to serve as an important advisor to his ward once he reached his majority. Throughout the panegyric, Claudian is at great pains to show the general as a protector and confidant. He is 'a confidence in war, an advisor in peace' (*'fiducia belli, pacis consilium'*).⁴³ But perhaps the greatest sign of his masculinity is simply the presence of his person: his strength and success in war itself inspired ancient virtue, '[Thanks to you], a former age blossoms again with the virtues of Romulus' (*'pristina Romuleis infloruit artibus aetas'*).⁴⁴ Stilicho is thus not only depicted as an exemplar of manliness, but also one that emphasised the core of that peculiar term pejoratively coined by the Christian writer, Tertullian: *Romanitas* (what it means to be Roman) – a conceit that could not have been lost on Claudian's readers given the general's ethnicity.⁴⁵

In contrast, Honorius compares less well in this poem and elsewhere, as Claudian's three surviving panegyrics celebrating the emperor's consulships illustrate. In theory, 'the obvious aim was to present ... a future heir to the throne and to the imperial

monopoly of victory'.⁴⁶ But that did not come to fruition. While these panegyrics praise the young emperor, they focus more on his potential to become a worthy heir of his father; they thus more often centre on advice to the young ruler than create an encomium of his accomplishments.⁴⁷ Indeed, Meaghan McEvoy has recently argued that there were practical political reasons for depicting Honorius as immature and needing direction: it increased the legitimacy and standing of his guardian.⁴⁸ Thus, in the poet's commemoration of his third consulship (396 CE), for example, Honorius is little more than a royal boy, eager to share in the victories of his father, but too young to understand them or to be anything other than Stilicho's precocious ward.⁴⁹ Claudian's poem commemorating Honorius's fourth consulship (398 CE) is scarcely better: there is an extensive and instructive speech given by Theodosius to his son on how to be a good ruler (ll. 214–352) – which his heir interrupts with youthful zeal to proclaim his willingness – but once again Stilicho is called upon to guide him to his potential greatness. The topic is *virtus*, but a very different kind from his guardian. For Honorius, *virtus* is meant as a means to fight off the common shortcomings of rulers: lust (*cupido*), pride (*superbia*) and anger (*furens*). Significantly, his most important counsel is to be a pious ruler.⁵⁰ Thus, as Catherine Ware has recently observed, this advice significantly does not include being a great conqueror or powerful ruler, but to be a link in the glorious chain of Spanish emperors starting with Trajan and continuing through the Theodosian house.⁵¹ And again, Claudian does not (or cannot) point to anything tangible Honorius has accomplished; the poet can only speak of the good fortune to come in the new year, 'The prosperity of Romulus's realm is promised'.⁵²

Even Claudian's panegyric to the emperor's sixth consulship (404 CE), when the younger son of Theodosius had ostensibly reached his majority (and thus theoretical independence to rule in his own right), is once again an exercise of the general's 'soldierly duty' (*fortior cura*, ll. 232–3), completely overshadowing Honorius. Alaric, the Visigothic leader, curses Stilicho's name, not the emperor's.⁵³ No less than Rome herself tells the younger man, as his mother (*vestra parens*), that he should not engage in battle and instead return to the capital, enriching it with his countenance, and leave the real work to his guardian.⁵⁴ Now old enough to master his youthful impetuosity (as Theodosius advised) – a sign of his new maturity – he reassures the goddess: he will return to the Senate and People. Honorius even tells Roma that Stilicho is his Odysseus for wisdom and his Horatius for martial valour!⁵⁵ In short, the emperor is reduced to an ornamental cipher: he may reign gloriously, but he does not rule.

But while Claudian's panegyrics to Honorius's consulships and those of several others outside the imperial house are not as laudatory – or rather, they offer praise of a different sort – they are at least in some sense complementary to Stilicho's.⁵⁶ Collectively, all of Claudian's consular panegyrics emphasise the office holders' respective pedigrees and honours to justify their place. While not as accomplished as the general, they are nevertheless worthy of the consular office. A perhaps more interesting comparison can be made with Claudian's attacks against the grand chamberlain (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*) Eutropius, Stilicho's counterpart in Constantinople and the eastern emperor Arcadius's puppet master for several years. Unlike Stilicho, Eutropius was a civil official and eunuch, and the mutual hostility between the two men, combined with Eutropius's appointment to the consulship in 399 (the first time

a eunuch had held the office) offered Claudian the occasion to engage in magnificent vituperation. Indeed, his formal invective was an inversion of panegyric, with many of the same rules of structure and language of that genre.⁵⁷ To that end, in two separate poems, Eutropius is described constantly as womanly or sexless (or both) and his consulship as an affront to everything that is Roman:

All [portents] cease at the monstrous eunuch consul. O woe, beautiful heaven and earth! An old woman in consular robes is paraded throughout the cities and an effeminate's name is given to the year ... the *fascēs* must be purified by the consul and the prodigy itself must be sacrificed.⁵⁸

Stilicho's counterpart is moreover a direct inversion of the general.⁵⁹ Instead of commanding troops, Eutropius commands legions of unmanned men:

He returns in victory: he is followed by infantry, standards, and throngs and maniples of eunuchs just like himself – a legion most worthy of Priapus's banners.⁶⁰

The reference to the god of fertility in the last clause was intended to be both obscene and ironic, one to which he makes clearer a short space later in a contrast between a goddess of eunuchs and a god of war, 'Or, if it please the gods, you should prefer Cybele to Mars'.⁶¹ These inversions of Stilicho's nature and accomplishments continue throughout these polemical works: a majority of his insults focus on Eutropius's effeminacy, lack of manliness and perversion of both sexes. It is also important to note that Claudian's poems excoriating Eutropius were also probably written the year before his *magnum opus* to Stilicho's consulship.⁶² Thus, the chronology of the pieces not only created a timely contrast between the two men, but gave the poet opportunity to create a rhetorical *contre-pointe* to what had come before.⁶³ Finally, it created a marked contrast between the two capitals of the empire and their respective leaders, with Stilicho being associated with the original and presumably more masculine, virtuous Rome. In late antiquity, 'Rome was a powerful symbol for citizens of the later empire; the identifications they made begin to adumbrate the ends to which Claudian could employ it'.⁶⁴

On the Gothic War (De Bello Gothico)

Turning now to our second work, the short epic *De Bello Gothico*, we have Claudian's recreation of the relatively insignificant battle of Pollentia in 401 CE, in which Stilicho forced Alaric to retreat from Italy. Like his much longer panegyric to the general's consulship, this poem emphasises the martial valour and *virtus* of the general. Indeed, given its brevity, this work more than any other probably articulates the striking parallels between traditional republican virtue and Stilicho's. There are three important and key themes related to masculinity in this short tale of war, an account that contains very few lines devoted to the actual battle itself.

First, there is military prowess and courage in the traditional sense. Not only does the poet speak explicitly of the general's *virtus*, but also in terms of the actions in which he partakes:

Your right hand has plucked us from imminent death, and has returned to their homes and fields our people – by fate damned – and will have been saved by your virtue.⁶⁵

Single-handedly achieving great victories without even lifting a sword is another common theme: for example, later Stilicho convinces Rome's Germanic allies (*foederati*) who had made common cause with Alaric to return to loyal service (ll. 380–99), reminding them of the wrath Philip of Macedon faced after siding treacherously with Hannibal against Rome. Nor are personal strength and skills neglected. He personally braved violent and turbulent weather conditions to get to the enemy, rushing in at a key moment in the battle when an (unnamed) Alan leader is killed:

The cavalry, thrown into confusion by the death of that man, turned their reins around and their whole wing, having been cut off, would have faltered had not Stilicho, quickly gathering together a legion and rushing in with reserve troops, restored the cavalry to the fight with his foot soldiers.⁶⁶

And incidentally, he vanquished the Visigothic leader, Alaric (whose survival and continued threat Claudian conveniently ignores). But the means by which the poet extols his bravery is a conscious throwback to the republic: Stilicho is compared – favourably – to the likes of Fabius Maximus, Decius Mus, Scipio the Elder and others of republican fame (ll. 124–64). But these all pale in comparison. Stilicho's only true rivals are Camillus, the Second Founder of Rome (ll. 430–32), and ultimately Gaius Marius:

And write in this single inscription a double victory: 'Here the Italian soil covers the brave Cimbri and Getae, owed to our brilliant generals Stilicho and Marius. Raging hordes, learn not to be heedless of Rome.'⁶⁷

Completely missing are any references to imperial exemplars, another common feature of late antique prose panegyric.⁶⁸ But this goes further than complimentary comparisons to these men: the general's courage is also placed in a republican context by making explicit reference to the Senate's ancient responsibility for safeguarding the state, while at the same time seeking national glory and triumphs:

Wherefore, in the days of old, if I remember aright, with sweet liberty invigorating us, the Senate prospered with its own soldiers far and wide, and, always prosecuting enemies far from their homes, safely these men with honour waged wars far across the seas . . . But in truth whenever savage storm was about to strike our homeland or hung over our head, vacuous expressions of empty fury moved them not, but instead they considered gravely the state's health . . .⁶⁹

A second curious component, reworking a theme in Claudian's panegyric to Stilicho's first consulship, is the imperviousness of the general's body. Not only is he talented in warfare, wise in governance and a keen observer of portents, but his body also shows no sign of weakness or disfigurement. He eagerly rushes northwards through Italy over rough terrain and in harsh weather to get at Alaric's army, unaffected and brilliantly handsome (l. 357 '*praeclarum*'). And while Roman soldiers and enemies alike show the scars of battle – traditionally as an indication of their experience, courage and honour in war – Stilicho is only described as strong and literally glowing.⁷⁰ Even Alaric bears wounds. One allied leader's visage is particularly evocative:

No part of him was absent of wounds and his glory shone more proudly from a disfigurement of his face.⁷¹

But compare this Alan war chieftan, worthy of the Elysian fields (l. 590), to the general. No similar descriptions of his body are mentioned, a curious lacuna in a narrative extolling warfare. In contrast, his white hair gleams in the dusty battlefield (ll. 459–60: '*fulsit canities*'); his body possesses, with shoulders that could (figuratively) support the empire, superlative powers of strength and endurance:

Restore Rome its dignity and let your shoulders hold up the mass of our teetering empire; this battlefield will vindicate all; and this victory will decree peace to the world.⁷²

As with the panegyric to Stilicho's consulship, Claudian associates his physical abilities with Rome's success. Weather, harsh campaigning conditions and battle itself have no impact on his body; indeed, it thrives under the harsh treatment of the elements and of warfare. The contrast between the bodies of normal men and the general's distinguishes him further; Stilicho is greater (l. 211: '*maior Stilicho*').

This stands in marked contrast with the only description of Honorius's body as a young man, described in the panegyric to the emperor's sixth consulship (404 CE): while he has strong shoulders (*fortes umeros*), he also has blooming cheeks (*flore genas*) and an emerald-studded neck as beautiful as Bacchus's.⁷³ In his green-gemmed consular cloak (a robe that Claudian describes quite differently in Stilicho's consulship), Honorius is almost feminine, especially when contrasted to the general and stern soldiers who follow the consul-elect in procession.⁷⁴ The general's ward has come into the first blush of manhood; Stilicho's happiness is seeing a beautiful youth finally entering his majority.⁷⁵ And Eutropius's body? Claudian misses no chance to describe the eunuch's physical shortcomings, but one digression is particularly damning: he is emaciated (*nudis ossibus*), wrinkled like a raisin (*uva rugiosor*), balding (*deserta . . . intervalla comae*; literally 'an empty expanse of hair'), mangy (*scabie laceras*) and pale (*pallida*).⁷⁶ As Long summarises, 'Degradation and revulsion are fundamental aims of the images Claudian deploys against Eutropius'.⁷⁷

The third theme of manhood is raised in Stilicho's most extended speech (ll. 269–313), where he is trying to hearten the citizens of Rome against Alaric's assault. Significantly, he finishes his address by talking about their families and his own. He notes that he is not so hard-hearted as to ignore the importance of kin – and here he mentions explicitly husband to wife, father to son, and father-in-law to son-in-law. He proclaims his love for his own family and wishes to be with them in this time of peril, but duty and honour impel him to go out and meet the enemy for the safety of the Roman state:

Nor do I strongly give you advice that to me alone I avoid heeding: here is my wife, my family, my son-in-law, more dear than all that is bright. No portion of mine is free from being carried off by this storm.⁷⁸

In this case, Claudian offers an interesting ambiguity about Stilicho's nature as a parent. As father-in-law, the poet clearly refers to Honorius; but as a guardian to the teenaged emperor, he may be referring to the general as a *de facto* father as well.

Following from that noble sentiment, protecting Rome as its parent is of key importance, and in fact spurs Stilicho to action:

Like an enormous lion leaving its hungry cubs back in its cave, he exits afire into the winter night and silently crosses the deep snow; his shoulders stiff with cruel hoar-frost; icicles binding his

golden pelt; but he neither fears death nor cares for either snow or rime, while he gathers food for his children.⁷⁹

Again, the association between the protector of the family and the state is stressed – a *parens publicus*, as the senator Symmachus obsequiously styled Stilicho; the general's martial and physical qualities are put to this purpose.⁸⁰ And it is this theme of the idealised man within the family that is enlarged upon in our third poem.

A Celebratory Poem on the Marriage of the Emperor Honorius (Epithalamium de Nuptiis Honorii Augusti)

Thus we turn lastly to Claudian's celebration of the marriage of the emperor Honorius and Maria – an event that happened in 398 CE when both spouses were minors, although probably technically able to wed.⁸¹ Here again, chronology is important: it precedes both *De Consulatu Stilichonis* and *De Bello Gothico*. Many of the qualities already discussed, then, had come from earlier works, but it is significant that the celebration of Honorius and Maria's marriage would serve as Claudian's first opportunity to develop in full a connection between masculinity and family.

One might think that the *Epithalamium* might honour and extol the nuptial couple, since that is its ostensible purpose. And to a degree it does, but almost tangentially.⁸² Instead, the poet places his attention on the father of the bride. In so doing, the poem pulls away from the actual event and focuses more broadly on notions of what constituted proper courting, betrothal and marriage. By extension, it reflects the ideals of manhood within the broader context of the two families and their respective *patresfamilias*.

Claudian begins by describing a union forged by love, but cognisant of the niceties of family honour and respect. His readers are first made privy to the love-struck thoughts of the young emperor (grandiose for a boy who was perhaps fourteen). Honorius is a youth impatient to be married: already, before marriage, he calls Stilicho father-in-law (*socer*).⁸³ He arranges to send betrothal gifts of great value and antiquity.⁸⁴ His pursuit of Maria has been honourable and proper by respecting Stilicho's choice for his daughter. Honorius, as emperor and *sui iuris*, has even formally sent representatives of high rank to Stilicho as agents trying to petition for the marriage, paying proper respect to the father, his family and his authority.⁸⁵

But Claudian also emphasises that the marriage was one wanted by Honorius' now dead father, and with Stilicho fulfilling an old promise to his former master. It was Theodosius who had given Serena to Stilicho to wed, and so Maria is rightfully owed in return, 'Pay to me with interest that due my father; return to the palace its own'.⁸⁶ Indeed, Stilicho himself is aware of this responsibility: the general's troops speak directly to the *genius* of Theodosius, informing the long-departed emperor that his servant's debt and duty to his old master has been repaid.⁸⁷ Moreover, Serena had cared for Honorius when he was just a boy and he was thus the couple's *de facto* child.⁸⁸ As such, Claudian's Honorius reasons that it is right and proper to marry Maria, since it is assumed that such children should marry their adopted siblings, 'Why not give over a daughter to your young adopted son?'⁸⁹ Respect for family honour and a father's *potestas* are thus articulated and preserved.

The poem has no description of the actual wedding – something Claudian was fully capable of – but climaxes with the celebration after the ceremony.⁹⁰ The guest

of honour is, unsurprisingly, Stilicho. Although the protector of his ward and of the empire, Stilicho has for this occasion hung up his war mantle, and Rome's soldiers (ll. 295–98) have dressed in white, anointed themselves with fragrant myrtle and wear laurel leaves (*velati lauro myrtoque*). They toast not the bride and groom, or even the groom as emperor, but rather the bride's father. Claudian takes special care to describe the perfection of his body, saying that he is the ideal combination of the gifts that both youth and age bestow upon a man, 'has anyone possessed such a face?'⁹¹ Hailed as the most fortunate of fathers (*fortunatissime patrum*), it is the wedding party's greatest hope that Stilicho's own son, Eucherius, shall surpass his father and that Thermantia, his younger daughter, shall make as good a match as Maria.⁹² Claudian thus draws a parallel between son and ward. But even more important are the two fathers, Stilicho and the departed Theodosius, and their respective roles as the prime movers in their respective children's marriage. In that sense, Stilicho is acting as guardian, father-in-law and father all rolled into one. This is an idea that is rearticulated more concisely in Claudian's much shorter Fescennine verses celebrating the imperial marriage:

Where your head is normally covered with a war helm, bind your hair with a garland, Stilicho! Let the war trumpets cease and the blessed [wedding] torch consign bloody Mars to far places. Let that royal blood, which was taken from the palace, be returned to the palace. As your fatherly duty, join together the pledged spouses with your right hand. You were first the son-in-law to an emperor; now in return you will be father-in-law to one. Shall there now be rage of envy? Or will there be any care given to jealousy? Stilicho is father-in-law; Stilicho is father.⁹³

Renewal ends the *Epithalamium*, 'Thus let Maria's womb grow large and let be born to the purple a little Honorius sitting on his grandfather's knee'.⁹⁴ The line of glorious emperors, thanks to Stilicho, may continue.

Conclusion

What then can we say about Claudian's image of Stilicho? These three poems, and many others, offer a broad depiction of the general's virtues and his roles in the private sphere and the public life of the state. Quite apart from the praise that is heaped upon the general, it also offers significant insights into the constructions of masculinity among the elite (and arguably emperors) of late antiquity. While there are a number of notable and often unique qualities here, three significant features stand out.

First, Claudian has largely subverted traditional republican *virtus* invested in the imperial person and imperial order, and has assigned it to the western empire's chief general. That is, those things that typically were associated with the ruler's masculinity – courage and fearlessness in war, a generally martial demeanour while on campaign and skill worthy of comparison to Rome's triumphing generals of old – were now transferred to Honorius's guardian. This is in part a conscious exercise in classicising, but more significantly, it is a self-reflexive statement about who actually holds power in the state. By possessing all the warlike virtues traditionally reserved for the imperial person, Stilicho largely replaces the emperor. The collected *virtus* of Rome's republican leaders is distilled into his person (so, too, occasionally the *arete* of mythical Greek heroes). That he additionally proves to be an able and honest administrator of the state encourages Claudian's subversion of the emperor. This is no 'corporate imperial rule'

between Stilicho and his ward – or, at best, only one of a senior and extremely junior partner.⁹⁵

Second, there is an emphasis placed on the perfection of the body as an important component of manliness, something new in the Roman discourse of masculinity and something that would become increasingly important in Byzantine representations of the imperial person. In this, we see interesting comparisons with Christian notions about the human vessel. The Christian interest in creating a body free from the deleterious effects of sin and the constant temptations of the physical world are paralleled by the idealised body of Stilicho and its imperviousness to the vicissitudes of his life.⁹⁶ Indeed, the strength and perfection of the body under duress is nearly identical in both cases. This analogue cannot be called a substantive ‘Christianising’ influence, but certainly displays a reorientation of the understanding of the body and its relationship to masculinity. In that sense, there is correlation, but no causation; rather both concepts seem to be products of deeper cultural attitudes about the ideal (or idealised) male.⁹⁷ As Brent Shaw has argued, the endurance of physical pain and suffering – *hypomone* – had developed in the second and third centuries from being a passive feminised virtue to one of active self-control; that is, a sign of manliness.⁹⁸ Here, it is taken a step further: Stilicho’s endurance of the hardships of war and (one may presume) state responsibilities not only speak to his masculine qualities, but his uniqueness in their perfecting powers.

Finally, there is a new centrality between masculinity and family. This is perhaps unsurprising as the expression of male *potestas* came within the sphere of the household. Admittedly, this may also be related to a peculiar need for Stilicho’s legitimacy: Natalie Boymel Kampen, in her study of the diptych of Stilicho, Serena and Eucherius, has observed that the piece’s atypicality in including family members was directly related to his provisional relationship to the Theodosian house.⁹⁹ But Kampen also noted important social forces shaping the artist’s use of traditional motifs and elements in new ways; in this case, it is the general’s need to articulate control and individual agency through the creation of family ties and the continuation of dynasty – an adjunct to the imperial family. This seems not only a guiding principle in Claudian’s Stilicho, but ties into a broader male anxiety about patriarchy and control.

We see, then, an original mixture of traditional and late antique elements in the construction of masculinity. While the language and imagery of his poetry displays the classicising tendencies of late antique high literature, the representation of manliness illustrates, like the age itself, a transitional quality. Returning briefly to his panegyric of Honorius’s sixth consulship, his last dateable poem, Claudian sums of Stilicho’s virtues: *fides*, *constantia*, and *pietas* (l. 586). While these were perhaps not the virtues of traditional Roman masculinity, they were nevertheless appropriate in describing a new man for a new era.

Notes

This article began as a paper presented at the International Medieval Congress in Leeds 2011, in a panel on medieval masculinities organised by Shaun Tougher. I would like to thank Shaun and the anonymous referees who gave extremely useful advice in its revision.

1. By masculinity, I refer primarily to the hegemonic positioning of men in a gender order. As a working concept, it is a positioning that focuses on the way that men generally seek to define themselves with

- respect to other men. See R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (1995; 2nd edn, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), pp. 21–34.
2. Cicero's most general and comprehensive description came in *pro lege Manilia, passim*, but see esp. 28–30 and 61–8. He also notes that *virtus* might be applied to women by possessing *pudicitia*; *ad Fam.* 14 and *Att.* 10:8.
 3. See esp., Donald C. Earl, *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967); Werner Eisenhut, *Virtus Romana: Ihre Stellung im römischen Wertsystem* (Munich: Fink, 1973).
 4. Nathan Rosenstein, *Rome at War: Farms, Families, and Death in the Middle Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), pp. 2–4.
 5. On its original construction near the *Porta Capena*, Cic., *de nat. deorum* ii:61. On its subsequent enlargement to a double temple to *Virtus* and *Honos* (Honour) by M. Claudius Marcellus, Livy, xxv:40:1–3, xxvii:25:7–9, xxix:11:13 and Val. Max., i:1:8. It survived at least until the fourth century CE; *Notitia* 1, in Henri Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1871), 2:ii, 541. Gaius Marius dedicated a second double temple to *Virtus* and *Honos*, probably on the Capitoline; Festus 344 and Vit., vii:praef:17. This latter temple had some importance in the late Republic: the Senate voted there to rescind Cicero's exile in 57; Cic., *pro Sest.* 116. See also Eric Orlin, *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 131, 154 n. 153.
 6. Myles McDonnell, *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 64–71. Much of the problematisation relates to the notion that the development of *virtus* was closely linked to the dynamics of the Roman family. McDonnell's argument in part comes from a legalistic understanding of the place and power of the *paterfamilias* and *patria potestas*. While that authority was in theory absolute, there has been considerable scholarship challenging the reality of that power. See esp. Richard Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Richard Saller, 'Roman Kinship: Structure and Sentiment', in Beryl Rawson and Paul Weaver (eds), *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 7–34, for a general criticism of using legal sources to reconstruct the Roman family. For other criticisms of McDonnell, see Robert A. Caster, 'Review', *BMCR* (2007:02:08), <<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2007/2007-02-08.html>> (accessed 3 June 2014).
 7. Monographs and collections include Colleen Conway, *Behold the Man: Jesus and Graeco-Roman Masculinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Matthew Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Gender Ambiguity and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Caroline Vander Stichele and Todd Penner, *Contextualizing Gender in Early Christian Discourse: Thinking Beyond Thecla* (London: T & T Clark International, 2009); Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Lin Foxhall and John Salmon (eds), *When Men were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1998); Lin Foxhall and John Salmon (eds), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1998). See also Moisés Mayordomo-Marín, 'Konstruktionen von Männlichkeit in der Antike und der paulischen Korintherkorrespondenz', *Evangelische Theologie* 68 (2008), pp. 99–115.
 8. See Richard Alston, 'Arms and the Man', in Foxhall and Salmon (eds), *When Men Were Men*, pp. 205–23, here p. 222.
 9. Catharine Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), see esp. pp. 190–98.
 10. Although see Steven L. Tuck, 'The Origins of Roman Imperial Hunting Imagery: Domitian and the Redefinition of *Virtus* under the Principate', *Greece and Rome* 52 (2005), pp. 221–45. He argues that hunting – or at least its depiction – heavily influenced concepts of masculinity in the second to the fourth centuries CE. As an analogue to warfare, it was a private and politically 'safe' activity for elite men to display their *virtus*.
 11. The quotation is from *CIL* vi:1710: 'ἐνὶ βιργιλίῳ νόον καὶ Μοῦσαν Ὀμηρου'. As G. O. Hutchison notes, this is the first known example of an imperially commissioned statue and inscription honouring a poet; *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 50.
 12. The unfinished *Rape of Proserpina* (*De raptu Proserpinae*) is in itself worthy of much discussion with regard to gender, but is not relevant here. On its composition, see J. B. Hall (ed.), *Claudian: De Raptu Proserpinae*, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 93–105.
 13. Michael Barnes, 'Claudian', in John Miles Foley, *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005), pp. 538–50, esp. pp. 543–5. See also Michael

- Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 1–3.
14. See C. E. V. Nixon and Barbara Saylor Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 10–14 for a discussion of when and how such comparisons were to be used. See more broadly, Roger Rees, ‘Panegyric’, in William Dominik and Jon Hall (eds), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 136–48, esp. pp. 144–8.
 15. While panegyric could be poetry or prose, the *Panegyrici Latini* are far better known. For the issue of public performance, see Sabine MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), pp. 1–14.
 16. For a modern overview, see Roger Rees, ‘The Modern History of Latin Panegyric’, in Roger Rees, *Latin Panegyric*, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 3–48.
 17. Although some have argued for the originality of Claudian’s work; in particular, Roberts, *The Jeweled Style*, pp. 54–5.
 18. Catherine Ware, *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
 19. Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 282. See also Rees, *Latin Panegyric*, pp. 46–7. John F. Makowski, ‘Claudianus “Ardens et concitatus”’, paper given at *Aetas Claudianus* conference, Berlin, June 2002. He notes the considerable influence Lucan had on Claudian’s poetry.
 20. Maud Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), esp. pp. 55–81. ‘Part of the process of male socialization’ was the practice of oratory among the social elite, p. xxvi.
 21. Lin Foxhall, ‘Introduction’, in Foxhall and Salmon (eds), *When Men Were Men*, pp. 1–9, here p. 7. We know that Claudian’s audience went beyond those who may have heard public performance of his panegyrics. Alan Cameron has demonstrated that Orosius and Augustine, for example, had read at least some of his works, suggesting not only broad geographic distribution, but also a broad reading public; Cameron, *Claudian*, pp. 228–52. Stilicho also apparently had his works published in a comprehensive collection, perhaps shortly after Claudian’s purported death in 404 CE; Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda*, pp. 419–22. For more on Claudian’s audience, see Jacqueline Long *Claudian’s In Eutropium: Or How, When and Why to Slander a Eunuch* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 195–201. See also below.
 22. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda*, pp. 366–8. See also John Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, AD 364–425* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 263–71. On his mixed heritage, see note 27 below. While men like Stilicho had been common in imperial service and courts since at least the late third century, the senatorial aristocracy of the West, and Italy in particular, wielded considerably more influence than their counterparts in the East; see Beat Näf, *Senatorische Selbstdarstellung im spätantiken Rom im Spiegel der epigraphischen Denkmäler* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2000). We should also not overlook practical political problems the general faced; see Meaghan A. McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule in the Late Roman West, AD 367–455* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 158–9.
 23. Michael Roberts, *The Jeweled Style*. Note J. Vanderspoel, ‘Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints’, *Classical Quarterly* 36 (1986), pp. 244–55.
 24. Claudian wrote only one overtly Christian work, *de Salvatore*. For a discussion of Claudian’s religious proclivities, see Vanderspoel, ‘Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints’.
 25. Although note recently Marie-France Guipponi-Gineste, *Claudian: Poète du monde à la cour d’Occident* (Paris: De Boccard, 2010), pp. 7–8, who correctly points out how little we actually know of the poet’s life.
 26. On his later life and death, see David T. Fletcher, *The Death of Stilicho: A Study of Interpretations* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Indiana University, 2004).
 27. On his father, however, see below; Stilicho’s detractors commonly called him *demibarbarus*; e.g. Jer. *Ep.* 123:16 (writing, however, *after* his downfall in 408).
 28. While generally, most Germanic peoples prescribed to Arian Christianity, there is some circumstantial evidence to suggest that Stilicho followed Nicene orthodoxy. He was married in 384 to the niece and adopted daughter of an emperor who had only recently established the Nicene Creed as orthodox at the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381 CE). See Siegmar Döpp, *Zeitgeschichte in Dichtungen Claudians: Hermes Einzelschriften* 43 (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1980), pp. 26–8.
 29. On this, see Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda*, pp. 38–45.
 30. Stilicho is the first to be styled this unique Western title, in 398 (*CTh* vii:22:12).

31. On Stilicho's career, see most recently McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule*, pp. 153–86. See also John Michael O'Flynn, *Generalissimos of the Roman Empire* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1983), pp. 14–42; François Paschoult, *Zosime: Histoire Nouvelle*, 5 vols (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971–2000), vol. 3, part 1, pp. 222–6.
32. Ware, *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition*, esp. pp. 18–31 where he argues convincingly that Claudian's panegyrics are strongly influenced by classical epic poetry in substance and structure: 'Claudian's success arose from his ability to exploit the innate encomiastic element of epic', p. 29.
33. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are mine. *De cons. Stil.*, ll. 24–35: '*Etenim mortalibus ex quo tellus coepta coeli, numquam sincera bonorum sors ulli concessa viro. Quem vultus honestat, dedecorant mores; animus quem pulchrior ornat, corpus destituit. Bellis insignior ille, sed pacem foedat vitiiis. Hic publica felix, sed privata minus. Partitum; singula quemque nobilitant: hunc forma decens, hunc robur in armis, hunc rigor, hunc pietas, illum sollertia iuris, hunc suboles castique tori. Sparguntur in omnes, in te mixta fluunt; et quae divis beatos efficiunt, collecta tenes*'.
34. *De Cons. Stil.*, ll. 45–53: '*spondebat ducem celsi nitor igneus oris membrorumque modus, qualem nec carmina fingunt semideis. Quacumque alte graderis in urbe, cedentes spatii adsurgente videbas, quamvis miles adhuc. Taciti suffragi vulgi iam tibi detulerant, quidquid mox debuit aula*'.
35. Plato, *Protagoras* 330b. See also, e.g., Cicero, *De Inventione* ii:159; Ambrose, *Comm. in Luc.* v:62 (commenting on the Beatitudes) and Augustine, *De Moribus Eccl. Cath.* 25.
36. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, 'The Emperor and His Virtues', *Historia* 30 (1981), pp. 298–323, here p. 318.
37. D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 76–94. *Men. Rhet.*, ii:373: See also Nixon and Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, pp. 23, 401 n. 36. The question of whether Claudian was familiar with Menander's works has not been explicitly addressed, but see Ware, *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition*, pp. 22–3; Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium*, p. 31; Martha Vinson, 'Rhetoric and Writing Strategies in the Ninth Century', in Elizabeth Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001* (Oxford: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 9–22, here p. 16. On authorship of Menander's second treatise, see Malcolm Heath, *Menander: A Rhetor in Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 127–31. See also Russell and Wilson, *Menander Rhetor*, pp. xxxiv–xl.
38. *De Cons. Stil.* ii:62–65. See Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), pp. 95–8. Significantly, *pietas* towards the gods and the nation is a third virtue, something important to Honorius' depiction; see below.
39. *AE* 1952, 165; *AE* 1954, 39; *AE* 1994, 27.
40. *De Cons. Stil.* iii:174–6; *In Ruf.* I, ll. 260–67; *In Eut.* II, ll. 600–02.
41. John Alexander Lobur, *Consensus, Concordia, and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology* (New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 32.
42. *De Cons. Stil.*, ll. 27–29: '*Non illum praemia tantum quam labor ipse iuvat; strepitus fastidit inanes inque animis hominum pompa meliore triumphat*'.
43. *De Cons. Stil.* iii:122–3.
44. *De Cons. Stil.* iii:124.
45. Admittedly, *Romanitas* was not a common term, but on its ancient and modern usage, see Guy Halsall, 'The Barbarian Invasion', in Paul Fouracre (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, 7 vols (1995–2005), vol. 1, pp. 35–55, here pp. 39–40. See also W. M. Daly, 'Christianitas Eclipses Romanitas in the Life of Sidonius Apollinaris', in Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni (eds), *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan* (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1987), pp. 7–26.
46. Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, Past and Present Publications 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 122.
47. See Catherine Ware on this advisory theme and its dependence on Pliny's panegyric; Catherine Ware, 'Claudian's Advice to the Emperor Arcadius', *Arethusa Special Edition: Pliny in Late Antiquity* 46 (2013), pp. 313–31.
48. McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule*, pp. 160–61.
49. *Pan. III Cos. Hon.*, ll. 142–162.
50. *Pan. IV Cos. Hon.*, l. 276: '*Sis pius in primis*'. On piety as a new important component of an emperor's virtues, see McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule*, pp. 319–21.
51. Ware, 'Claudian's Advice to the Emperor Arcadius', pp. 316–19.
52. *Pan. IV Cos. Hon.*, l. 619: '*Prospera Romuleis sperantur*'. *Sperantur* might also be translated as 'is hoped for', an even more conditional qualifier on Honorius' role as consul and emperor.
53. *Pan. VI Con. Hon.*, ll. 300–09.

54. *Pan. VI Con. Hon.*, ll. 383–425.
55. *Pan. VI Con. Hon.*, ll. 477–90. In describing Horatius' stand against Tarquin and Lars Porsenna, Claudian makes specific mention of his *clipeus*, which defended Rome (*quo texerat urbem*), ll. 484–7. See note 40 above.
56. Claudian's panegyric celebrating the consulships of two brothers in 395 CE, Probinus and Olybrius (*Panegyricus dictus Probino et Olybrio Consulibus*) is important for several reasons, not least because it was composed prior to the poet's appointment to the Western court. He also wrote a panegyric celebrating the consulship of Flavius Manlius in 399.
57. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda*, p. 255.
58. *In Eut.* i:ll. 8–10, 21–2: '*Omnia cesserunt eunucho consule monstra. Heu terrae caelique pudor! Tra-beata per urbes ostentatur anus titulumque effeminat anni . . . Consule lustrandi fasces ipsoque litandum prodigio*'.
59. Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium*, p. 263.
60. *In Eut.* i:ll. 254–6: '*Pro victore reddit: peditum vexilla sequuntur et turmae similes eunuchorumque manipuli, Hellesponticis legio dignissima signis*'.
61. *In Eut. I.* l. 277: '*Vel, si sacra placent, habeas pro Marte Cybele*'. The Galli, priests of Cybele, were notorious in the Empire for the practice of self-emasculation as part of their initiation into the priesthood; see Will Roscoe, 'Priests of the Goddess: Gender Transgression in Antiquity', *History of Religions* 35 (1996), pp. 195–230.
62. It is worth noting here that Claudian's panegyric to Flavius Manlius's consulship, in the same year as Eutropius's, offers another marked contrast, 'Here [the Western Empire] the consular office is not violated; disgraceful names do not defile the Latin list of office holders' (ll. 266–7: '*non hic violata curulis, turpia non Latios incestant nomina fastos*').
63. Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium*, pp. 45–7.
64. Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium*, p. 195.
65. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 41–3: '*Tua nos urgenti dextera leto eripuit, teetisque suis reduntur et agris damnati fato populi, virtute renati*'.
66. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 594–7: '*Morte viri turbatus eques flectebat habenas totaque praeciso nutassent agmina cornu, ni celer instructa Stilichone legione secutus peditum pugnam instauresset equestrum*'.
67. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 645–7: '*Et duplices signet titulos commune tropaeum: "Hic Cimbros fortesque Getas, Stilichone peremptos et Mario claris ducibus, tegit Italia tellus. Discite vesanae Romam non temere gentes"*'.
68. See C. E. V. Nixon, 'The Use of the Past by the Gallic Panegyrists', in Graeme Clarke et al. (eds), *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (Canberra: Harcourt Brace, 1990), pp. 1–36, esp. pp. 6, 29–35.
69. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 104–9, 111–14: '*Quamquam, si veterum certamine rite recordor, tunc etiam, pulchra cum libertate vigerent et proprio late florent milite patres, semper ab his famae petiere insignia bellis, quae diversa procul tuto trans aequora vires execere dabant . . . At vero Italiam quotiens atrox tempestas ipsumque caput laesura pendit, non illis vani ratio ventosa furoris, sed graviter spectata salus*'. This may also be a not so subtle reminder that Stilicho permitted the war against Count Gildo in North Africa to be declared by the Senate several years before.
70. See Matthew Leigh, 'Wounding and Popular Rhetoric at Rome', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 40 (1995), pp. 195–215.
71. *De Bell. Goth.*, ll. 586–7: '*Vulneribus pars nulla vacat rescissaque contis gloria foedati splendit iactantior oris*'. Also worth noting is Alaric's 'senate' (*curia*) of elder Visigothic leaders: their faces and bodies similarly are covered with scars (*quos plagis decorat numerosa cicatrix*); l. 482.
72. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 571–3: '*Romanum reparate decus molemque labantis imperii fulcite umeris; hic omnia campo vindicat, haec mundo pacem victoria sancit*'.
73. *Gena* can also refer to a young lover. *Pan. VI Con. Hon.* ll. 560–64. It is perhaps significant that Honorius is compared to Lyaeus, one of the epithets of Bacchus (see Ver. *Georg.*, ii:229) – a manifestation of the god that removes fear and anxiety from men. Such a comparison might be especially suitable in a consular panegyric. On the association of Dionysus with the feminine, see Froma I. Zeitlin, 'Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality and the Feminine in Greek Drama', in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 63–96. See also Michael Jameson, 'The Asexuality of Dionysus', in Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone (eds), *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 44–64.
74. *Pan. VI Con. Hon.* ll. 578–602. On the consular robes, see Michael Dewar, *Panegyricus de Sexto Consulatus Honorii Augusti*, edited with introduction, translation and literary commentary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 228–32, 379–80.

75. See Gleason, *Making Men*, pp. 69–70, on the orator's construction of the masculine body and, by extension, how to reveal the effeminate man, pp. 73–8.
76. *In Eut. I*, ll. 110–37.
77. Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium*, p. 116. See her discussion on this passage, pp. 116–19.
78. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 328–30: '*Nec vobis fortis monitor, mihi cautior uni: hic coniunx, hic progenies, hic carior omni luce gener; pars nulla mei subducta procellae*'.
79. *De Bel. Goth.*, ll. 323–9: '*Sic ille relinquens ieiunos antro catulos inmanior exit hiberna sub nocte leo tacitusque per altas incedit furiale nives; stant collapruinis aspera; flaventes adstringit stiria saetas; nec meminit leti nimbosve aut firgora curat, dum natis alimenta parat*'.
80. Symm., *Ep.*, iv:12 and 14.
81. The legal age of marriage was fourteen for males and twelve for females; McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule*, p. 160, states that Honorius was thirteen. For Roman classical rules and their practice in Late Antiquity, see Anti Arjava, *Women and Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 29–36. Zosimus, probably trying to explain why there was no issue from the marriage, suggests that Maria's mother, Serena, managed to keep her a virgin by drugging Honorius; *HN* v:28.
82. See also Claudian's much shorter *Fescennina de nuptiis Honorii Augusti* below.
83. Claud., *Epith. de nup. Hon. Aug.* ll. 20–21.
84. *Epith.* ll. 10–13. A necklace supposedly worn by Livia and other empresses is the prized gift.
85. *Epith.* ll. 32–3.
86. *Epith.* ll. 37–8: '*faenus mihi solve paternum, redde suos aulae*'. The implication here is that Maria is worth even more than Serena because she was the daughter of both Serena and Stilicho.
87. *Epith.* ll. 300–05. And if, as Katherine Wasdin has recently argued, this poem is really a metaphoric elegy for war, Honorius' chief general would of course be the means by which the emperor might succeed in his (nuptial) conquest. Katherine Wasdin, 'Honorius Triumphant: Poetry and Politics in Claudian's Wedding Poems', *Classical Philology* 109 (2014), pp. 48–65. Significantly, she ties the *Epithalamium* to the poet's contemporary panegyric to Stilicho's victory over Gildo – two different forms of suppression and conquest.
88. See Geoffrey Nathan, "'Woe to those Making Widows their Prey and Robbing the Fatherless': Christian Ideals and the Obligations of Stepfathers in Late Antiquity", in Sabine R. Hübner and David M. Ratzan (eds), *Growing up Fatherless in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 273–92.
89. *Epith.* l. 44: '*Quid iuveni natam non reddis alumno?*' The jurist, Gaius, seems to imply that this was a relatively common event; *G* i:60. See also, Sabine R. Hübner, "'Brother-Sister Marriage in Roman Egypt': A Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy?", *Journal of Roman Studies* 97 (2007), pp. 21–49, in which she deals extensively with marriage between adoptive siblings.
90. See Claudian's much shorter *epithalamium* for the tribune Palladius and Celerinna (*Carm. min.* xxv). Stilicho gets credit for choosing the bride; ll. 93–4. So, too, in the *Fescennina de nuptiis Honorii Augusti*.
91. '*Fronte quis aequali?*' (l. 316).
92. *Epith.* ll. 338–9.
93. *Fesc. Nupt. Hon. Aug.*, iii (xiii): '*Solitas galea fulgere comas, Stilicho, molli necte corona. Cessent litui saevumque procul Martem felix taeda releget. Tractus ab aula rursus in aulam redeat sanguis. Patris officiis iunge potenti pignora dextra. Gener Augusti pridem fueras, nunc rursus eris socer Augusti. Quae iam rabies livoris erit? Vel quis dabitur color invidiae? Stilicho socer est, pater est Stilicho*'.
94. *Epith.* ll. 340–41: '*Sic uterus crescat Mariae; sic natus in ostro parvus Honoriades genibus considat avitis*'.
95. McEvoy, *Child Emperor Rule*, p. 169.
96. See Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Colombia University Press, 2008); G. Nathan, 'Medicine and Sexual Practices in Late Antiquity', *Epoche* 18 (1993), pp. 20–32.
97. See Gillian Cloke, *This Female Man of God* (London: Routledge, 1995); Brown, *Body and Society*, pp. 160–78.
98. Brent D. Shaw, 'Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996), pp. 269–312.
99. Natalie Boymel Kampen, *Family Fictions in Roman Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 123–38.